Office Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
MAR 13 1928
CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY
CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1927.

No. 285.

HOLLAND FURNITURE COMPANY,
Petitioner,

vs.

PERKINS GLUE COMPANY.

REPLY BRIEF FOR PETITIONER

and

APPENDIX OF OPINIONS.

CHARLES E. HUGHES,
WILLIAM H. DAVIS,
JAMES A. WATSON,
R. MORTON ADAMS,
of Counsel.

March 10, 1928.

GALLO & ACKERMAN, Inc., 142 Liberty Street, 'Phones—Rector 7257-8.

SYNOPTICAL INDEX.

PAGES

General Statement 1-2

(1) Confusion as to process and product is introduced by plaintiff's irrelevant discussion of preferred two-step process 3

(2) Defendant's position envisages the product independent of the process 3

(3) Deleting confusion as to process and product from plaintiff's brief, two statements emerge: 3-4

(a) "That Perkins attained his vegetable glue by using a starch not too far degenerated (i. e., not to soluble starch or dextrine)" dissolved in 3 parts or less of water and alkali;

(b) "That it was the use of the critically small amount of water with a suitable starch which resulted in the new good as animal glue for veneering."

The fallacy of proposition (a) above 5-8
The fallacy of proposition (b) above 8-30

The language of the claims 9
The prior art 11
The law 14

(4) Misinterpretation by plaintiff, and by the Court below, of the statement that "certain grades of untreated cassava carbohydrates" may be used 30-35

PAGES

(5) Plaintiff's erroneous assertion that defendant's glue is the same product as the Perkins glue ..35-37

(6) Certain other inconsistencies in plaintiff's brief..37-42

(a) Plaintiff's statement that no one satisfactorily glued together two pieces of wood with starch glue until Mr. Perkins did it 38

(b) The colloquy between Court and counsel in the Hood-Wright and West Michigan cases 38

(7) The erroneous assertion that the Courts that have sustained defendant's position limited the product claims to "Perkins' preferred two-step process" with chemical degeneration 42-46

Judge Geiger's opinion discussed in this regard 42

Decision of the Court of Appeals of the Seventh Circuit affirming Judge Geiger discussed in this regard 42

(8) The contention that the disclaimer cannot affect the product claims 46-48

(9) The opinion furnished to plaintiff by former Judge E. Henry Lacombe 49

INDEX OF CASES.

PAGES

American, etc., Co. vs. Mesta, etc., Co., 18 Fed. (2d) 538 28
Bene vs. Jeantet, 129 U. S., 683 ..... 21, 24
Carver vs. Hyde, 16 Pet., 513 19
Cochrane vs. Badische, etc., Fabrik, 111 U. S., 293 21
Cochrane vs. Deener, 94 U. S., 780 2
Corn Planter Case, 23 Wall., 181 ..... 5, 6
Corning, et al. vs. Burden, 15 How., 252 19
Electric R. Signal Co. vs. Hall, 114 U. S., 87 5
Fuller vs. Yentzer, 94 U. S., 288 30
Grant vs. Raymond, 6 Pet., 218 24
Hobbs vs. Beach, 180 U. S., 383 ..... 5, 47
Howard vs. Detroit Stove Works, 150 U. S., 164 24
Matheson vs. Campbell, 78 Fed., 910 ..... 25, 29
Minerals Separation, Ltd. vs. Butte, etc., Co., 250 U. S., 336 17
Mitchell vs. Tilghman, 19 Wall., 287 ..... 5, 29
O'Reilly, et al. vs. Morse, et al., 15 How., 62 18
Packing Co. Cases, 105 U. S., 566 48
Perkins Glue Co. vs. Gould Mfg. Co., and Wisconsin Chair Co., 280 Fed., 728; 292 Fed., 596; 263 U. S., 718 42
Perkins Glue Co. vs. Hood-Wright and West Michigan Furniture Co., 279 Fed., 454 ..... 6, 7, 38, 39
Perkins Glue Co. vs. Solva Waterproof Glue Co., 293 Fed., 792; 251 Fed., 64 ..... 6, 7, 8, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38, 42, 43, 47, 48
Rubber Co. vs. Goodyear, 76 U. S., 788 ..... 47, 48, 49
Seymour vs. Osborne, 11 Wall., 516 29
The Incandescent Lamp Patent, 159 U. S., 465 ..... 22, 23, 24, 25
Tyler vs. Boston, 7 Wall., 327 ..... 20, 24
Western Electric Co. vs. Ansonia, 114 U. S., 447 48
Westinghouse vs. Boyden, 170 U. S., 534 ..... 5, 30
Wood vs. Underhill, et al., 5 How., 1 ..... 16, 24